UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/925,466	08/10/2001	Yoshitoshi Yamagiwa	0994-0216P	4584

2292 7590 09/27/2007

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER	
SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/27/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/925,466	YAMAGIWA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mohammad A. Siddiqi	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07/05/2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-12,14,15,17 and 18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-12,14,15,17 and 18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 14-15, 17, and 18 are presented for examination.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/05/2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 12, 14-15, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghosh et al. (6,741,265) (hereinafter Ghosh) in view of Kask et al. (6,542,937) (hereinafter Kask).

5. As per claim 1, Ghosh discloses a method for providing data-processing service, said method comprising the steps of: uploading product design data (transfer function provided by central unit, col 7, line 64) via the internet (col 4, line 41) from a client computer to a server computer (11, fig 1) of an application service provider (fig 1, col 4, lines 34-41; col 5, lines 25-40), said product design data corresponding to data used by a product design company (col 5, lines 1-14) that makes the product (col 5, lines 1-14; lines 54-67); and

subjecting the product design data to data processing by using an application program provided in the server computer (col 6, line 66 to col 7, line 21), said application program (11 fig 1, col 7, lines 35-51) converting the product design data having a first form to mold design data having a second form different from the first form (col 7, lines 13-67), said mold design data corresponding to data used by a mold design company that designs a mold for the product made by the product design company (col 5, lines 1-14; col 8, lines 36-53), and

wherein the product design data is converted by the application program (col 7, lines 35-54; col 36-54) into the mold design data to design a mold for making the product designed with the product design data (col 7, lines 35-54; col 36-54) by first converting the product design data into the mold design data (col 5, lines 1-14; col 8, lines 36-53), and

wherein the subjecting step further comprises providing a screen (graphic user interface, col 7, lines 35-53) for allowing a user to selectively designate a format of the product design data among a plurality of formats for different product design data and to designate a format of the mold design data among a plurality of formats for different mold design data (design tools, and manufacturing tools; col 3, lines 7-18; col 7, lines 22-53) such that the product design data is converted into the mold design data to design the mold for making the product designed with he product design data (col 7, lines 22-53). Gosh teaches network-based design methods where the central processor concerts product design into mold design. Gosh does not explicitly teach first converting the product design data into intermediate data having a standard form and then converting the intermediate data having the standard form into the mold design data. However, Kask teaches first converting the product design data into intermediate data having a standard form and then converting the intermediate data having the standard form into the mold design data

(Application program interface transfer data between bend program and CAD program, col 5, lines 29-64). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the API library of data transfer taught by Kask into the system of the Gosh to transfer data between two applications.

6. As per claim 2, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Kask discloses the sever computer stores the mold design data in a state that enables the mold design data to be downloaded to the client computer (col 3, lines 16-25).

7. As per claim 4, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Kask discloses the product design data are three dimensional CAD data (col 3, lines 5-53).

8. As per claim 5, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Kask discloses wherein the product design data are three dimensional CAD data regarding product design (col 3, lines 5-53).

9. As per claim 6, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Kask discloses wherein the mold design data are three-dimensional (col 3, lines 5-53).

10. As per claim 7, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Kask discloses wherein the mold design data are three-dimensional CAD data for mold design (col 3, lines 5-53).

11. As per claim 8, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Ghosh discloses wherein when the product design data are uploaded to the server computer, a backup file containing the product design data is stored so as to enable re-conversion processing to be performed by use of the backup file in a revival processing mode (please see claim 11, col 5, line 54 to col 6, line 21; col 3 lines 5-17).

12. As per claim 9, Ghosh discloses conversion process, and invitation to the client (col 5, line 54 to col 6, line 21), a start mail indicating start of the conversion processing is transmitted to a mailer of an administrator who administrates the server (col 6, lines 49-65).

13. As per claim 10, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 9, above. In addition, in addition, Ghosh discloses an end mail indicating end of

the conversion processing is transmitted to a mailer of an administrator who administrates the server computer (col 6, lines 49-65).

14. As per claim 11, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 10, above. In addition, Ghosh discloses a completion mail indicating completion of the conversion processing is transmitted to a mailer of a user (col 6, lines 49-65)

15. As per claim 12, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Kask discloses further comprising the step of downloading the mold design data from the server computer to the client computer (col 3, lines 10-25).

16. As per claim 14, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition, Ghosh discloses the product design data is data regarding a product designed using a software program for product and the mold design data is data for mold design that can be used by a software program for mold design (col 7, lines 5-53).

17. As per claim 15, The claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In addition, Kask discloses the product design data is compatible

with a first software program and the mold design data is compatible with a second software program different from the first software program (col 3, lines 5-53).

18. As per claim 17, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 15, above. In addition, Kask discloses the product design data is data regarding a product designed using the first software program, said first software program being for product design and the mold design data is data for mold design that can be used by the second software program, said second software program being for mold design (col 3, lines 5-53)

19. As per claim 18, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 15, above.

Response to Arguments

20. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U.S. Patent 5,900,259

U.S. Patent 6,647,305

U.S. Patent 7,069,192

U.S. Patent 7,218,979

U.S. Patent 5,966,310

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A. Siddiqi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MAS

NATHAN FLYNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER